

REMARKS

Claims 1, 7 and 16-30 are pending in this application. Reconsideration and allowance in view of the following remarks are respectfully requested.

A. THE CLAIMS DEFINE PATENTABLE SUBJECT MATTER

In the Office Action, claims 1-7 and 9-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ellmore, US Pat. No. 7,058,817 in view of Baker, US pat. No. 6,611,498. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The features of claim 1 are set forth above. In particular, claim 1 recites:

connecting to a trusted service provider having special access requirements, wherein a **trusted service module acts as an intermediary** between the host service provider and the trusted service provider; and

wherein the trusted service module receives a sessionID from the trusted service provider;

wherein the **trusted service module places a text file** on the user's network data acquisition module;

In the prior January 25, 2007 Office Action (page 4), the Office Action set forth the basis of the rejection of such claimed features. In particular, the prior Office Action asserted that:

As to claims 2 and 10, Ellmore discloses a trusted service module (140 fig. 1) acts as an intermediary between the host service provider and the trusted service provider (see col. 5 line 17 to col. 6 line 55),

As to claims 3 and 5, Ellmore discloses receiving the session ID from the trusted service provider and text file comprising a cookie (see figs. 2, 3, col. 6 line 66 to col. 7 line 67).

As to claims 4,6 and 9, Ellmore discloses placing a text file on the user's network data acquisition module and registering the user with the remote service provider (see col. 9 lines 3-60 and col. 10 lines 20-64).

Accordingly, as was discussed in Applicant's April 25, 2007 Response, the Office Action relied on Ellmore's component 140 as the trusted service module. Applicant argued that the element 140 of Ellmore (relied on in the prior Office Action for the trusted service module) is

described as a communication server. Such fails to teach the particulars as recited in claim 1, i.e., the trusted service module places a text file, as recited.

Applicant argued such deficiency of Ellmore in the prior response. Such deficiency was in the teachings of Ellmore, i.e., the primary reference applied in the Office Action. In the present 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection, Ellmore is retained as the primary reference.

Relatedly, on page 9, the present Office Action asserts that:

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 7 and 16-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

However, Applicant submits that such arguments are not moot. Such arguments laid with the deficiencies of the primary reference. While the secondary reference has been changed (i.e., Baker is used rather than Hobbs (U.S. Patent 5,987,454)), the deficiencies with Ellmore remain.

The Office Action has not addressed such deficiencies. Applicant respectfully submits that not only has the Office Action not addressed such deficiencies (i.e., the arguments set forth in the prior Response), the Office Action fails to provide guidance as to what now allegedly constitutes the “trusted service module”.

That is, deficiencies (in the rejection) lay in that Ellmore fails to teach the particulars of the claimed “trusted service module.” The prior Office Action provided some guidance as to what the Office Action was interpreting as the trusted service module, i.e., the January 25, 2007 Office Action interpreted Ellmore's component 140 as the trusted service module. However, in the present Office Action, no guidance is provided as to what allegedly constitutes the “trusted service module.” As such is clearly a point of argument, Applicant submits that the Office Action should indeed clearly set forth what allegedly constitutes such trusted service module.

Instead, the Office Action generally references Ellmore's Figs. 2, 3, col.6, line 66 - col. 7, line 67. That is, the Office Action asserts the Ellmore teaches:

the host service provider directing the user to the remote service provider in such manner that the user is presented with information, in a single user interface, that is provided by both the host service provider and the remote service provider connecting to a trusted service provider having special access requirements, wherein a **trusted service module** acts as an intermediary between the host service provider and the trusted service provider (using single login processes to process user accesses, see figs. 2, 3, col. 6 line 66 to col. 7 line 67).

wherein the **trusted service module** receives a session ID from the trusted service provider and registering the user with the remote service provider (see col. 7 line 21 to col. 8 line 56).

Ellmore fails to teach the claimed trusted service module. The Office Action has failed to respond to Applicant's prior arguments and has failed to specify what constitutes the trusted service module.

Applicant further notes the Office Action on page 3, wherein the Office Action asserts:

Ellmore does not specifically disclose the simultaneous interactions between user and the provider, and **placing a text file** comprising a cookie on the user's network data acquisition module. However, Baker discloses the simultaneous interactions between user and the provider, and **placing a text file** comprising a cookie on the user's network data acquisition module (providing a cipher spec message which provides server authentication during a session associating a given HTTPS request with a logical session which is initiated and tracked by a "cookie jar server" to generate a "cookie" which is a unique server-generated key that is sent to the client along with each reply to a HTTPS request and providing simultaneous interactive communication between user and a server, see Baker's abstract, col. 8 line 50 to col. 9 line 59 and col. 17 line 46 to col. 18 line 46). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Hobbs' teachings into the method of Ellmore to process user requests because it would have provided an invaluable tool for enabling customers of a telecommunications enterprise to manage their telecommunication assets, quickly and securely, from anywhere in the world using the Internet.

However, such assertions even if true (which such is not admitted) fail to support the rejection. That is, claim 1 does not simply recite that a text file is placed on the user's network data acquisition module. Rather, claim 1 particularly recites that the **trusted service module** **places a text file** on the user's network data acquisition module.

Thus, in summary, Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action makes a general assertion that Ellmore teaches the claimed trusted service module, and that such assertion is not supported by the teachings of Ellmore. Then, the Office Action generally asserts that Baker teaches placing a text file (see such text above). However, the Office Action fully fails to allege or support that the trusted service module places the text file, as recited. Further, the Office Action fails to set forth even what allegedly constitutes the “trusted service module”.

On page 4, line 7, the Office Action refers to “Hobbs”. The Examiner is requested to confirm that such is an oversight, i.e., in that the rejection is based on Ellmore and Baker.

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 recites patentable subject matter at least for the reasons set forth above. Further, claims 7 and new claim 29 recite patentable subject matter at least for some of the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Applicant submits that the dependent claims recite patentable subject matter at least for their various dependencies on claims 1, 7, and 29, as well as for the additional subject matter recited in such dependent claims.

The applied art to Ellmore and Baker fails to teach or suggest the claimed features, either alone or in combination. Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection is respectfully requested.

Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection is respectfully requested.

B. CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons outlined above, Applicant respectfully asserts that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully solicited.

For any fees due in connection with filing this Response the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the undersigned's Deposit Account No. 50-0206.

Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,
HUNTON & WILLIAMS



James R. Miner
Registration No. 40,444

Hunton & Williams
1900 K Street, N.W., Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20006-1109
(202) 955-1500

Dated: **September 14, 2007**